



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,965	11/30/2001	Yannick Vincent	FR 000130	6951

24737 7590 06/20/2003

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, KIMBERLY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2876

DATE MAILED: 06/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/015,965

Applicant(s)

VINCENT, YANNICK

Examiner

Kimberly D. Nguyen

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Amendment

1. Receipt is acknowledged of Amendment filed 31 March 2003.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - Claims 4 and 8, line 2: "comprising:" should be inserted after the "hardware circuit [HARD]".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chiang (US 6,574,776).

Chiang teaches a data processing system, comprising:

a EDC/ECC-P processor 13/15, which serves as a microprocessor (see fig. 1),

a communication device communicating with an electronic module (i.e. memory unit 11, which serves as electronic module) intended to send a conventional signal to the microprocessor (i.e., providing data communication between memory unit 11 and the processors; see col. 1, line 66 through col. 2, line 26); and

a hardware circuit allowing an inversion an order of bits of a word as a function of a value of the conventional signal during a transfer of the word between the electronic module 11 and the microprocessor (fig. 7; col. 6, line 59 through col. 7, line 48).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang in view of Van Rensburg et al. (US 2003/0004891; hereinafter "Van Rensburg"). The teachings of Chiang have been discussed above.

Chiang fails to teach or fairly suggest the electronic module is a Subscriber Identity Module (hereinafter "SIM") card.

Van Rensburg teaches the electronic module 2 is a SIM card (fig. 2; paragraphs 41 and 50).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the SIM card as taught by Van Rensburg to the teachings of Chiang in order to employ memory card, such as SIM card, for conducting commercial transactions including a large number of participating system members.

7. Claims 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang in view of Muwafi et al. (US 5,978,822; hereinafter "Muwafi"). The teachings of Chiang have been discussed above.

Chiang fails to teach or fairly suggest the hardware circuit comprising a switch, a right shift register and a left shift register electrically connected to the switch.

Muwafi teaches a circuit which comprises switches (fig. 9, lines 19-25) and a post shift unit 80 to shift (to the left or right) the bits of each value processed (fig. 5; col. 8, lines 31-45).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the notoriously old and well known the order of bits of the word as taught by Muwafi to the teachings of Chiang in order to provide the instant system with a reduction of time for processing operations.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. In response to the applicant's argument "a hardware circuit [HARD] allowing inversion or no inversion of the order of bits of a word as a function of the value of the convention signal during transfer of the word between the electronic module [MOD] and the microprocessor [PRC]" (see page 8, lines 12-15), the examiner believes that given its broadest reasonable interpretation of the instant claims, the combination of the teachings of Chiang, Van Rensburg, and Muwafi meet the claimed limitations.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly D. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-1798. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on 703-305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the

Application/Control Number: 10/015,965

Page 5


Art Unit: 2876

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-1341 for regular communications and 703-305-1341 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-8792.

KDN

June 16, 2003


DIANE I. LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER